



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

The  
**American Historical Review**

THE MEETING OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL  
ASSOCIATION AT PROVIDENCE

A CITY of many historic memories and not a few ancient buildings, Providence is an eminently suitable place in which to hold one of the annual meetings of the American Historical Association. It is also so convenient of access by railroad from an area richly populated with members of the Association that about three hundred attended. As four other associations, the American Economic Association, the American Political Science Association, the Bibliographical Society of America and the American Sociological Society, held their annual meetings at the same time and place, and the New England History Teachers' Association assembled with the national historical body on one of the days, the resources of Providence with respect to hotel accommodations were taxed to their utmost. More serious was the sense of mental crowding and confusion which is inevitably produced by sessions so numerous, even if the Historical Association had not had, as it certainly did have, too full a programme. One who paused to reflect, if any were able to achieve that feat during those three days, must have felt some longings for those simpler days when as yet the other societies were not, days of quieter sessions, before the age—we need not borrow Burke's unamiable phrase about the age "of sophisters, economists and calculators"—but before the period of "entangling alliances".

But anything like physical crowding was wholly avoided by the careful arrangements made by the local committee, whose work deserves all praise, and by the fortunate presence, on or near the grounds of Brown University, of an abundance of suitable halls and rooms for the meetings and for the entertainment of all the societies. Seldom if ever at any annual meeting have all things

proceeded so smoothly. An especial advantage for such sessions was offered by the rooms of the Brown Union, abounding in opportunities for meeting and conversation, and supplemented by those afforded by the University Club. The larger gatherings were held in Sayles Hall and Manning Hall of Brown University. Receptions or luncheons were offered by the university, by the committee of management of the John Carter Brown Library, by the Rhode Island Historical Society, and by Mr. William B. Weeden, chairman of the committee of local arrangements, and Mrs. Weeden. The Rhode Island School of Design made all the societies free of its buildings and collections; and there was the usual "smoker".

The first evening, that of Wednesday, December 26, was occupied with a felicitous address of welcome by President Faunce of Brown University, and with the inaugural addresses of Professor J. W. Jenks of Cornell University, president of the American Economic Association, and of Judge Simeon E. Baldwin of New Haven, president of the American Historical Association, heard in joint session of the two bodies. Judge Baldwin's address, entitled "Religion Still the Key to History", has already been printed, in the January number of this journal. The subject of that of Professor Jenks was, "The Modern Standard of Business Honor". He first adverted to the new conditions under which modern business is conducted: the scale on which it is carried on, vastly larger than ever before; the want of personal contact between the business man and his workmen or his customers; the heightened extent to which directors of corporations are trustees for numerous stockholders; and the increased profits from monopolies that are technically legal, but economically and socially unjustifiable. He showed how the rapid development of these conditions had often prevented the evil of unjust courses from being fully and clearly seen. He urged that, while the state should go farther in forbidding unscrupulous practices and in enforcing publicity in the management of great business enterprises, yet it was plain from human nature and the experience of the ages that we must after all look to individual morals and the efforts of individuals as the chief sources of improvement, and must place the responsibility upon ourselves as individuals.

The subsequent sessions of the Association were divided, as usual, between those which were occupied with formal papers or prepared addresses and those which bore the character of free conferences on special topics. The session of Thursday morning was of the former sort, and was given to papers in European history. Professor

George L. Burr of Cornell University discoursed informally on "Protestantism and Tolerance". After glancing at the rise of intolerance in the early church, which served the sixteenth-century reformers as a model, and sketching the causes which at the close of the Middle Ages had brought about a practical freedom of thought not since reached perhaps in continental Europe, he followed in some detail the growing intolerance of the reformers, pointing out how by 1529-1530, the date of the birth of "Protestantism", Luther and his colleagues were advocating the punishment of heresy—and by death—under the name of sedition or of blasphemy, though it was left for Calvin to restore fully to heresy its place as a crime and to make valid in Protestantism the penal laws of the Middle Ages.

Professor Dana C. Munro of the University of Wisconsin dwelt on "The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century". The increasing study of the classical writers in that century he regarded as merely the culmination of a movement which had been going on through the preceding centuries. There was no distinct renaissance of letters. But the twelfth century was characterized in a remarkable degree by the evolution of the spirit of independence, not only in such matters as the growth of freedom and self-consciousness in communes and guilds, but especially in the prevalence of the spirit of free inquiry on the part of scholars, largely influenced by Aristotle, in the growth of interest in science, and in the enhancement of the practical desire to turn all things to immediate use.

Mr. Henry Osborn Taylor of New York City read an interesting paper entitled "An Instance of Medieval Humanism: Some Letters of Hildebert of Lavardin". Hildebert of Lavardin, who became bishop of Le Mans in 1095, and in 1125 archbishop of Tours, finely exemplifies in the balance and temperance of his attitude towards life, and incidentally in his facile scholarship, the subtle working of the antique culture upon character and temperament. As a classical scholar he was unexcelled in his time, and was a skillful writer of both prose and verse. Some of his poems in elegiac metre have been mistaken by comparatively modern scholars for genuine antiques. In his elegy on Rome, one of his best, one is almost startled to hear the frank medieval note of admiration for the idols of pagan Rome. And yet the major part of Hildebert was Christian, as his theological writings thoroughly attest. His classic tastes gave temperance to his Christian views. How sweetly the elements were mixed in him appears in a famous letter written to William of Champeaux, wherein he balances temperately and soundly the advantages of the active and the contemplative life. Hildebert's writings evince that kind

of classical scholarship which springs only from great study and great love. His soul does not appear to have been riven by a consciousness of sin in this behalf. Sometimes he passes so gently from Christian to pagan ethics, as to lead one to suspect that he did not deeply feel the inconsistency between them. Or again he seems satisfied with the moral reasonings of paganism, and sets them forth without a qualm. For instance in a letter which he writes to King Henry consoling him upon the loss of his son in the *White Ship* there is a strain of reasoning which would much more naturally have come from the lips of Seneca than from an archbishop of the time of St. Bernard. But the antique in Hildebert's ethical consolations reflects a manner of reasoning rather than an emotional mood. The emotion, the love and yearning, of medieval religion was largely the gift of Christianity.

Miss Louise R. Loomis of Cornell University followed with a paper on "The Greek Renaissance in Italy". The conventional view has described that movement as the abrupt recovery at the close of the fourteenth century and the opening of the fifteenth of the long-forgotten stores of Hellenic literature, and the emancipation under its stimulating influence of the Italian intellect from the bondage of medieval ignorance and superstition. Against this view she urged the temporary revival of Greek by the schoolmen of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the superficiality of the knowledge of Greek actually acquired by the Italian humanists of the early fifteenth century, the conventional quality of their eulogies of Hellenic literature, the many evidences that the culture which deeply impressed them and elicited their real admiration was that of Rome and Alexandria, that their literary model was Cicero, their Platonism secondary and derivative.

In a discussion of the last three of these papers Professors James H. Robinson of Columbia University and Paul Van Dyke of Princeton endeavored to bring them into unity by dealing with the Renaissance as a movement continuing through several centuries, rather than comprised in any one century. Professor Robinson set forth this thesis in its more extreme form, Professor Van Dyke in one more qualified, representing the fifteenth century more distinctly as the culmination of a long process.

While these papers were being read, the Bibliographical Society of America was considering topics which were in large part historical or of interest to the writers of history. Dr. Reuben G. Thwaites of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin read portions of a valuable report on the bibliographical work of historical socie-

ties, and Dr. J. F. Jameson in response to inquiry gave some information as to such bibliographical work as is undertaken by the Department of Historical Research in the Carnegie Institution. The need of a bibliography of American colonial newspapers was considered by Mr. Clarence S. Brigham, librarian of the Rhode Island Historical Society, in a formal paper, and in remarks by Mr. William Nelson of the New Jersey Historical Society, Mr. Victor H. Paltsits of the Lenox Library, and others. A committee was appointed to consider the proper mode of description of such files. Another body of source-material of much interest to students of American history was brought under discussion by Mr. Theodore L. Cole of Washington, who described the plans of the Association of American Law Schools for preparing by united effort a catalogue of printed issues of American colonial laws. A committee to consider co-operation on the part of the Bibliographical Society of America was appointed. At a later session the society took up the subject of an international catalogue of the current literature of the social sciences, including history.

On the afternoon of Thursday the American Historical Association held a joint session with the New England History Teachers' Association, devoted to the consideration of a report prepared by the Committee of Eight on History in Elementary Schools. The conference was presided over by Professor James A. James of Northwestern University, chairman of that committee. The portion of the report presented on this occasion was that which dealt with history in the sixth, seventh and eighth grades of the elementary schools. Professor James spoke of the methods used in reaching the conclusions, and of the purpose of the committee in its work. The committee desired to re-assert their belief that the subject-matter for a course in the elementary schools and especially for the last three grades should be selected from the field of American history. In the sixth grade it is recommended that attention be devoted to the beginnings of American history in England and in Europe at large, with a view to showing the historical dependence of American history and institutions upon the Old World; in the seventh grade should be studied the discovery, exploration and colonial history of America, while the last year should be given over to the history of the United States. The teacher's main task should be to give an historical representation of our national life, rather than to recount the events which have happened in America since the first discovery. He should aim mainly to teach the child what his fellow human beings have done and are doing and to

show him how to co-operate with them. He should endeavor to make clear the close relation of history with other subjects, especially its vital connection with geography and civics. It will be seen that the main features of the programme presented a year ago are retained.

Dr. Julius Sachs of Columbia University, a member of the committee, led in the discussion following the presentation of the report, remarked that the committee had abandoned as futile all attempt to develop an ideal plan of history teaching. They had, however, adopted a grouping of the work so broad that, as they hoped, it afforded the fullest scope for the most accomplished elementary teacher of history, and again so flexible that the teacher of lesser attainments, of restricted opportunities for self-culture, can make it the basis of a sound and logical presentation. No rigid adherence in detail to the minor sub-divisions of each year's work was contemplated. He pointed out, as an advantage of the plan, that the old method of going over the same ground each year was abandoned and a continuous narrative could be presented.

This last point was enlarged upon by Superintendent H. P. Lewis of Worcester, who maintained that the old method in striving after thoroughness had defeated its own purpose. Pupils, he said, had actually less knowledge of the facts of American history after two or three years of repetition than when their study of it had been confined to a single year, and furthermore by the time when they entered the high school had lost their interest in history. He believed that the report of the committee would commend itself to every earnest teacher of American history in our elementary schools; but suggested that the study of European history recommended for the sixth grade was rather too difficult, and believed in general that more emphasis should be placed on the economic aspects of history. Professor Herbert D. Foster of Dartmouth College commended the plan. He agreed with the suggestion as to the economic phases of history, but as to the place given to European history believed that it should be made even larger. To study the continuous development of some other country, say England, would help to keep the pupil from a provincially American turn of mind. Miss Lucy M. Salmon, professor in Vassar College, discussed the principal defects in the teaching of history in elementary schools. She traced them to inefficiency in the mass of such teachers as can now be tempted into the work of school-teaching, to the exaltation of method over substance, fostered by many text-books, and to the failure of teachers of history to hold frequent conferences with

others. The teacher should especially endeavor to develop the art of narration, and to arouse enthusiasm at an impressionable age.

Mr. Isaac O. Winslow, principal of a school in Providence, regarded the committee's plans as impracticable and too ambitious. The amount of work he considered as far too great. It would be better to have fewer details, to select a few large centres of interest and emphasize them. Qualitatively also the work proposed is too difficult. Pupils of sixth-grade age are not interested in tracing the origins of American institutions in European history; for them history is still largely a moral subject and its basis should be biography. It would be better, he thought, to devote the sixth and seventh years to American history, taking up European history with its American connections in the eighth year. Tested under average conditions he believed the scheme would not prove practicable. Dr. James Sullivan of the High School of Commerce, New York City, declared, on the other hand, that the plan marked an important forward step in that it gave the pupil some idea of European history, presented American history as part of world-history, thus inculcating a truer patriotism than mere jingoism, eliminated what was unimportant, and made a most wise selection of historical personages for biographical treatment.

An open impromptu discussion followed. Professor James announced that in the completed report of the committee due attention to geography, civics, literature and art in their relations to history would be provided for; and that the work laid down for the first five grades, and especially for the fourth and fifth, would have to do with American life or American heroes. Mr. A. P. Walker of the Boston Normal School emphasized anew the doctrine that no vivid interest can be aroused and maintained in the minds of immature pupils by merely going over somewhat more intensively a field already covered. Care would need to be exercised that teachers of lower grades should not appropriate subjects belonging to the upper grades. The plan in his opinion did not cover too much ground provided a proper method of exclusion were adopted. Dr. Ernest F. Henderson thought that the plan provided too much American history. He proposed a four-year course in modern history, dealing in successive years with German, French, English and American history. It is expected that the final report of the committee will be published in the course of the year 1907.

Upon the evening of the same day occurred a joint session held with the American Economic Association, at which two papers in economic history were read. The first was that of Professor



Ulysses G. Weatherly of Indiana State University on "Babeuf's Place in the History of Socialism." The French Revolution was not entirely a movement of the middle classes. The Jacobins tended towards community of property, and their fall in 1793 replaced the middle classes in power. Babeuf and his fellow-conspirators in 1795 were tried upon political charges and the economic character of their conspiracy remained in the background. Babeuf was released from prison in October, 1795, and immediately set about to establish a communistic system. His newspaper, the *Tribun du Peuple*, began to attack the existing system of ownership of property, and the capitalistic organization of industry. The Society of the Pantheon was organized to spread communistic principles, and lasted until 1796 when Babeuf was again arrested. Babeuf and his followers were too busy contending for their political principles to evolve a plan of a social system. The general principles of their plan were outlined in the *Analysis of the Doctrine of Babeuf*. Needs, not productive power, should determine the distribution of commodities. Babeuf's system, though communistic, was based upon the principles of modern scientific socialism. His belief that socialism was the only proper system justified revolution. Babeufism was the logical result of the principles of Rousseau, Robespierre and Saint Just. Babeuf's death in 1797 marked not only the disappearance of the last of the Jacobins, but that of the leader of revolutionary socialism as well. His movement was the logical predecessor of the revolutionary outbreak of 1830, and his doctrines were largely responsible for the later outbreak.

The second paper, by Professor Edwin F. Gay of Harvard University, led a discussion of "Some Recent Theories concerning the Stages of Economic Development." He reviewed the discussions of Roscher, Hildebrand, Knies, Marx, Rodbertus, Schmoller, and Bücher, but devoted most attention to Bücher's system, which has practically displaced all of the others. Bücher's system of economic stages is purely static in character, and takes no account of social forces. The system has not been fitted to the facts, but the facts to the system; it cannot be applied either to European or to American economic development. The scheme was developed with reference to Germany, and does not fit other countries. Bücher's separable generalizations, however, correspond roughly to historical events.

Miss Katharine Coman, professor in Wellesley College, criticized the existing theories of economic stages as being too narrow, and emphasized the view that any adequate exposition of the

course of industrial evolution, so complex are the phenomena, would require not one but a series of formulae. The world-encompassing transportation agencies have made the thread of sequence difficult to follow. Beyond a mere verbal analogy to the processes of biological growth economic evolution is not organic; sequence of forms is not inevitable. Yet human society is being progressively industrialized, and industrial progress is determined by the survival of the most efficient. Environment exercises always an important influence on the course of economics, and in our country the determining conditions have been free land and the absence of legislative restraint. The transitions have been remarkably rapid. Notwithstanding these disturbing forces—cheap and rapid transportation, world-commerce, and rapid transitions—the course of economic evolution in this country may be quite clearly traced. Professor Bogart of Princeton University disagreed with what he thought to be Professor Gay's view that correct historical generalizations of historical development are impossible. Existing schemes of economic stages might be incorrect, but all such schemes he thought of value for certain purposes. He thought it possible to find some broader generalizations which should be both correct and useful. Professor Richard T. Ely of the University of Wisconsin thought man's power over nature the true principle for the tracing of economic development. A classification so based is not absolute, but is helpful and convenient. Professor Gay closed the discussion. He thought that to posit economic stages was useful, but feared that hard and fast stages and classifications might dominate too much.

In the next forenoon two conferences were simultaneously held. The one, intended to serve the interests of college teachers, had as its topic "The Sequence of College Courses in History"; the other was a conference on the special problems of state and local historical societies. The former was presided over by Professor Max Farrand of Leland Stanford University, who described the order of courses provided in that institution. It begins with a series of introductory courses covering all the chief fields of general history, which must be taken in the first or second year of college. There is also what is called a library course, likewise to be taken in one or the other of these years, which is intended to give the student some preliminary knowledge of the means by which more elaborate studies should be conducted. After these courses the student must take one advanced course in history, to be pursued in detail, without taking which he cannot be graduated in history.

Professor George B. Adams of Yale University discussed frankly

the experiments made in the historical curriculum at that institution and their good and bad results. But one course is offered, he said, in the freshman year, a general introductory course in the medieval and modern history of western Europe. Experience had shown that the demand in the second year was for general courses, covering broad fields, rather than for more special courses, the fields of which were somewhat restricted. A course covering the whole of English history has been found best to meet this demand, while in the junior and senior years a free elective system prevails.

Professor A. C. McLaughlin of the University of Chicago remarked that while a fixed sequence of studies after a general introductory course may be advisable, there are many difficulties in preparing any rigid scheme, especially if the arrangement is made to depend only on the location and extent of the periods that may be selected. The guiding principle of the order of courses ought not to be the choice of fields for their own sakes. Any sequence to be useful and helpful must be based on the purpose of bringing the student gradually into a fuller appreciation of what history is and what its methods are. The chiefest aim in any arrangement must be to bring the students into intellectual sympathy with history as a branch of modern developing knowledge and to give them the historical spirit, perspective, and a knowledge—not of full technical detail to be sure—but a reasonable knowledge of the essentials of historical criticism and construction.

Professor H. Morse Stephens of the University of California adverted to the differences of method which must be caused by the varying numbers of men and women in various institutions. The women students study history in order to become teachers of that subject, while the men most commonly intend to specialize in law or journalism later. Teachers must therefore differentiate sharply between the order and method employed in the instruction of men and those pursued with women. Professor Charles D. Hazen of Smith College urged that the ability of any particular student to pursue with profit a given course depended more upon his maturity than upon such preparation as might be offered by introductory courses. Thus, he said, the sequence may vary with every student, and he advocated a high degree of flexibility in the requirements. Professor Munro of Wisconsin related that at the University of Wisconsin a system of majors with a bachelor thesis obtains, and that a student who holds his major in history must take twenty-six semester-hours. In the freshman year three courses are open: ancient, medieval, and English history. In the following years all

the courses are open, subject to certain restrictions. Professor Burr of Cornell said that, other things being equal, he believed the chronological order to be the sensible one, and that at Cornell it is made the possible one. This point was emphasized by Professor C. H. Haskins, who stated that at Harvard the students, left free in their choice of studies, ordinarily and naturally follow a chronological order if given a fair chance. Professor Theodore C. Smith of Williams made a plea for the needs of the college as distinguished from the university in the teaching of history, while Professor Herbert D. Foster gave an account of co-operative teaching at Dartmouth, and Professor Albert B. White of the University of Minnesota stated that at that institution it was insisted upon that a student should have taken a course in English history before entering upon the study of American history.

The conference on the problems of state and local historical societies was presided over by Professor Benjamin F. Shambaugh, of the State University of Iowa. Two subjects were discussed, "Problems relative to the care and preservation of public archives", and "The marking of historical sites". Professor Herman V. Ames of the University of Pennsylvania, chairman of the Association's Public Archives Commission, was the first speaker and presented a review of the work of that commission during the seven years of its existence. The purpose of the Commission has been two-fold, to contribute information, in the form of printed reports, relative to the historical material in public archives, and to stimulate state and local governments to the proper care of such material. Forty reports, of which thirty-one have been published, have been prepared on the archives of twenty-nine states. It has been shown that hardly one of the older states has preserved complete files of its records, although the eastern states are better off in this respect than most of the others. There is however a very encouraging movement in those states where the need is greatest, for the proper care of public records. In Alabama, Mississippi, Arkansas, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North and South Carolina, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, and Iowa, the state archives are being provided for in accordance with recent legislation. In Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut attention has been directed to the care of local archives. Professor Ames concluded his report with mentioning two additional activities undertaken by the Commission: the selection by a sub-committee of the material in the British archives to be transcribed for the Library of Congress, and the preparation of a bibliography of the official pub-

lished records of the original thirteen states to 1789, and of such local records as have been printed in any of the states.

Mr. Luther R. Kelker, custodian of public records for the state of Pennsylvania, described the work which he has done in that office since his appointment in 1903, and the principles which he has followed in the arrangement of the material confided to him. Beside such work of arrangement, he has prepared copy for the fifth and sixth series of the Pennsylvania Archives. Mr. Clayton Torrence of the Virginia State Library described the archives of that state, including the portions which are in charge of the library, the land-office, the office of the secretary of state and the other executive offices, and the work which is being done toward putting them in order and making their contents available to historical students. In 1906 the Department of Archives and History was established, in charge of Mr. H. J. Eckenrode. The early petitions and other legislative papers have been sorted, and a calendar of the petitions is now in preparation. Mr. Torrence dwelt also on the county archives, the progressive losses of these treasures by fire, and the need of better treatment of the problems connected with them. Mr. John C. Parish of the State University of Iowa spoke of the work which has lately been carried on in connection with the public archives of that state, under the direction of Professor Shambaugh, and especially described the system of classification which has been adopted. The unprinted material is first classified according to three periods: the territorial, that of the first state constitution, and that of the present constitution (since 1857). For each of these the classification is according to the various offices from which the papers respectively emanated, then in subdivisions according to the external character of the documents (letters, reports, accounts, vouchers, etc.), then in still further subdivisions of a topical sort, in each of which the arrangement is chronological. It is proposed to issue calendars of various classes and to prepare a catalogue and an index to the whole mass. Mr. Worthington C. Ford, chief of the division of manuscripts in the Library of Congress, spoke briefly of the effect of sunlight on manuscripts exposed for exhibition or for other purposes, and described an ingenious device which, with the aid of the Bureau of Standards at Washington, he had prepared for measuring the extent of such damage.

The consideration of the marking of historic sites was opened by Professor Henry E. Bourne of Western Reserve University, in a paper in which he discussed the utility of such procedure

both in awakening patriotic feeling and in making the course of historic events more intelligible. The General Committee, of which he is chairman, had sent out questionnaires and attempted to secure a systematic body of information as to what had been done and was being done in this direction. He summarized the results of this inquiry, mentioning, as examples of the work going forward, that of the committee on the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of Medford, Massachusetts, that of the Germantown Site and Relic Society, that of the New York History Club, the marking of scenes of the Sioux War by the Minnesota Valley Society, the appropriation of fifteen hundred dollars by the General Assembly of Rhode Island for expenditure of this sort under the direction of the Rhode Island Historical Society, the military parks established by the United States government, and the work of various of the "patriotic-hereditary" societies. Fuller statements, of much interest, were made by Miss Jane Meade Welch of Buffalo on the work of the Niagara Frontier Landmarks Association, and by Miss Zoe Adams on the marking of the old Santa Fé Trail by the Kansas Daughters of the American Revolution, aided by the state, and on the interesting investigations which were undertaken for determining the route.

The sixth and seventh sessions of the Association, those of Friday evening and Saturday morning, December 28 and 29, were devoted to the reading of papers, the business meeting of the Association having been held on Friday afternoon. In the sixth session, devoted to the earlier portions of American history, four papers were read. We speak of three, for the fourth, that of Professor Claude H. Van Tyne of the University of Michigan, on "Sovereignty in the American Revolution", appears on later pages of the present number of this journal.

Miss Susan M. Kingsbury of Simmons College, reader of the first paper, entitled "A Comparison of the Virginia Company with the other English Trading Companies of the Seventeenth Century", endeavored to lead attention away from the study of the colonial movements associated with the name of the Virginia Company to the consideration of its composition as a trading organization. This was the aspect it chiefly bore to its founders and members. The writer entered upon a comparison of its organization and operations with those of some of the other English trading companies of the time. No less than thirty such were chartered in the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, but there are hardly more than half a dozen whose records are preserved and accessible in

such quantities as to make comparisons fruitful. Of these we may name the Merchant Adventurers, the Eastland Company, the Muscovy, Levant, and East India companies. Miss Kingsbury instituted comparisons between the Virginia Company and these, and also, so far as possible, the Providence Island Company, in respect to organization of the former as a joint stock corporation, its arrangements for the division of land and for returns from the joint stock, its instructions to outgoing agents and to the managers of its industrial enterprises, its financial system and the pecuniary result of its endeavors both in the period of large expenditures under Sir Thomas Smythe, and in the period of Sir Edwin Sandys, when company expenditures were less but were extensively supplemented by investments in minor associations subsidiary to the company itself. Miss Kingsbury properly emphasized the need, if this large trading movement is to be comparatively studied, of completer access to the copious bodies of materials for the history of the Royal African Company, the Providence Island Company, the Levant Company, and several others.

The paper which followed, by Professor Barrett Wendell of Harvard University, was of a general character, endeavoring to suggest the specific differences which distinguish three varieties of New England character—those centring in Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut. All these have their origin, he held, in the English character of the early seventeenth century, which brought to Massachusetts two incompatible tendencies—those of Protestantism, or the right of the individual to freedom from spiritual control, and of ecclesiastical system, in the peculiar form which this assumed in the early churches of New England. The typical character of Massachusetts, he suggested, has resulted from an unbroken conflict between these tendencies; while the typical character of Rhode Island has resulted from the dominant development of the Protestant tradition; and that of Connecticut from the dominant development of the ecclesiastical. Accordingly, the individuals of Massachusetts have been somewhat more distinctly developed; and the types of Rhode Island and of Connecticut have been, on the whole, more strongly pronounced. In illustration, he cited the character of Edwards, a native of Connecticut; Channing, a native of Rhode Island; and Emerson, a native of Massachusetts. Edwards, the greatest spiritual force produced by America in the eighteenth century, was the best exponent of complete divine authority; Channing stood as no other man for individual liberty within the limits of order; Emerson cast aside all

semblance of authority and stood for the greatest degree of individualism. The conflict which has prevailed in Massachusetts has made impossible the tenacity of type found in Rhode Island and Connecticut, a tenacity which has tended to prevent the development of striking personalities. For this reason the greatest literary figures of New England—Longfellow, Holmes, Whittier, Lowell, Hawthorne, Emerson—are all of Massachusetts. Such divergences as have been noted are what has made New England as a whole a vital, animating force in the life of the nation.

Next followed a paper by Mr. George L. Beer of Columbia University on "The Colonial Policy of Great Britain, 1760-1765". The general formula which in the eighteenth century summed up the reciprocal duties of Great Britain and the American colonies was that the former owed protection, the latter obedience. Protection, as quoted in the formula above, meant, in the main, naval defense; obedience signified, in general, conformity with those laws passed by Parliament in the interest of the empire as a whole. The course of events up to 1760 made imperative a reform in the colonial system of defense and a stricter enforcement of the laws of trade and navigation. The English colonial administration, therefore, directed its energies toward readjusting the laws of trade to the new conditions, toward encouraging the production in the colonies of products which Great Britain had to buy from competing European nations and, in general, toward increasing the mutual economic dependence of mother-country and colony. Measures were adopted with a view to stopping all illegal trade and to checking the purchase of French West Indian products by continental colonies. The new policy involved a reform of the customs service, the establishment of admiralty courts, the extension of British control over the Indian trade, and the imposition of Parliamentary taxes. This last part of the policy was carried out by enforcing, in a modified form, the molasses act of 1732, by laying duties on imports, and by passing a stamp act. By these measures enough revenue was raised to defray about one-third of the cost of the military establishment necessary for the protection of the colonies. The policy at once met with opposition, because the removal of the French from Canada had had the effect of making the colonies more independent, and this feeling became more and more apparent until the attempt on the part of the government to extend its administrative control over the colonies met with a decided check.

The final session, occupied with five papers on the later periods



of American history, was opened by Mr. Clarence S. Brigham, librarian of the Rhode Island Historical Society, with a contribution on "The Impressment of Seamen preceding the War of 1812". The conflicting orders of the English government and of Napoleon having thrown the carrying-trade into the hands of neutrals, British sailors rushed to man the American ships to such an extent that Gallatin declared them to constitute 2,500 out of 4,200 of the annual increase of the American marine. The right of impressment, ancient and in England undoubted, was in America regarded with feelings differing on party lines, in its application to the recovery of British sailors, or alleged British sailors, found on American ships. Judicial opinions on both sides of the ocean mostly upheld the rightfulness of such impressment, but the American executive denied it. Few sailors had been naturalized by the required five years' residence. The act of May 1796 provided for "protection papers", or certificates of citizenship. Four registers of these, from the Providence custom-house, have lately been acquired by the Rhode Island Historical Society. But such papers were shamelessly exchanged and otherwise abused. The speaker estimated that from ten to twenty thousand British sailors were serving on American vessels before the outbreak of war.

The second paper was by Professor Edward Channing on William Penn. The name of Penn, said Professor Channing, is one of the greatest of the seventeenth century, and his career has been studied most minutely. The charges of Macaulay have been refuted to the satisfaction of all investigators, yet there are some things in the career of Penn that are hard to understand. His attitude in the boundary disputes of Pennsylvania has frequently been misunderstood. Penn regarded his colony as a holy experiment in government but also, it should be remembered, as a great domain for himself. Two centres of colonial activity offered themselves in Pennsylvania, the valleys of the Delaware and the Susquehanna. Through the latter Penn desired to tap the northern fur-trade and with that in view sent agents to Albany to buy land from the Indians. His plans however were frustrated by Governor Dongan of New York, who maintained that the Iroquois were tributary to that colony, and who took a deed from the chiefs in his own name. In the south Penn was opposed by Baltimore, who claimed everything below the Schuylkill. Between the two Penn seemed likely to lose a large part of his grant. In addition to these territorial disputes Penn was beset with difficulties in the government of his colony. He was an idealist,

he desired to found a Quaker colony, yet was determined to have freedom of religion for all. Very probably a Quaker colony could have got along without laws, but non-Quakers, of whom there was a considerable influx, could not be dealt with in the Quaker meeting. Penn held that the end of government is the good of the people, that governments depend on men rather than men on government. This, it should be noted, was his idea before he had been a governor. He was a man of the highest ideals and the noblest intuitions, whose mind, however, was not fitted by nature or training to cope with practical problems of government or of business. The constitution which he made was an utter failure. This failure may be attributed to two causes. In the first place, his plan of government took away from the more numerous branch of the legislative body the right of amendment, and, a more vital defect still, denied to them also the privilege of initiation or even of discussion. The constitution which superseded the second Frame of Government and which proceeded from divided and unknown authorship remained a part of the organic law of Pennsylvania until the year 1776. How much of this constitution grew out of the idealistic notions of William Penn and how much proceeded from the experience of practical Pennsylvania politicians can never be determined because of the imperfections of the records bearing upon the subject.

The third paper of the morning, "Gustav Koerner, a Typical German-American Leader", by Professor E. B. Greene of the University of Illinois, was a biographical sketch intended to illustrate one phase of the colonization of America in the nineteenth century. The influence of the German colonists has been strongest in the Middle West, and in Cincinnati and St. Louis it has been decisive. In Illinois before the war the relation of the German element to the slavery contest was an important factor. One of the most interesting of the German communities in Illinois as early as the thirties was Belleville, whose leading citizen for half a century was the subject of this sketch. Koerner was born in Frankfort on the Main in 1809. His father was strongly anti-Napoleonic in sentiment and was in personal relations with Blücher and Stein. The son thus grew up in an atmosphere of liberalism the effects of which were strengthened by his education at Jena, where he was a member of the Burschenschaft, and at Munich, and Heidelberg. He took part in the July revolution of 1830, was present at the Hambach Festival, and, soon after his admission to the bar, took a leading part in the Frankfort insurrection of 1833. In this uprising he was wounded

and captured but made his escape and very shortly thereafter came to the United States. It was his intention to settle in Missouri but his dislike of slavery determined him in favor of Illinois. After a short law course at Transylvania University he was admitted to the bar at Vandalia and soon became one of the leading lawyers in southern Illinois. In politics he allied himself with the Democratic party, believing the Whigs to be tainted with Native-Americanism. In 1842 he was elected to the legislature and from 1845 to 1848 was on the supreme bench, resigning because of the insufficient salary. He was much interested in the European revolution of 1848 and prepared an address from the Belleville Germans which was sent to Germany urging the establishment of a republican government. He opposed the radical movement among the Germans which followed the influx of refugees about 1850 and which had for its purpose the demanding of special recognition of the Germans in America. In 1852 he was elected lieutenant-governor and came into close relations with Douglas, with whom he travelled making campaign speeches. When it became evident that the Democratic party would divide over slavery, Koerner transferred his allegiance from Douglas to Trumbull and contributed largely to the latter's election. In 1856, when the Republican party repudiated Native-Americanism, he joined its ranks and was a member of the convention of 1860. During the war he helped to raise troops, was military adviser to the governor of Illinois, was appointed to Fremont's staff, and was later made minister to Spain. During Grant's administration he went into the liberal wing of the Republican party and was a candidate for governor of Illinois. In the Hayes-Tilden campaign, however, he became a Democrat once more and was not again in public life.

The fourth paper, by Professor F. H. Hodder of the University of Kansas, dealt with "Some Aspects of the English Bill", the measure upon which the House and Senate compromised respecting the Lecompton constitution and the statehood of Kansas. The English bill provided that the Lecompton constitution should be resubmitted to the people of Kansas with the land-ordinance which had accompanied the constitution considerably amended. In case of the failure of Kansas to accept the constitution with the new ordinance, it was provided that the admission of the territory should be postponed until its population should be equal to the unit of Congressional representation. The bill was vigorously denounced at the time as a swindle and an attempt at bribing the people of Kansas with a grant of land. This view has been upheld by such

historians as Von Holst, Schouler, and Rhodes, but a careful study of the measure shows that such a view is not justified. The bill presented two issues, the constitution and the ordinance, and the conference committee endeavored to emphasize the latter and minor issue while minimizing the former which was really the more important. As a matter of fact the land-grant provided for in the bill was modelled after the corresponding section of the enabling act for Minnesota passed the year before, and was identical with the grant actually made to Kansas upon its admission in 1861. It has been the custom moreover to make grants of land upon the admission of new states, and while the amount has varied the grants of later years have generally been larger than the one in question. Finally any appearance of a bribe was removed by the fact that the grant provided for in the bill was actually smaller than the amount demanded in the ordinance accompanying the Leocompton constitution. More important than the matter of the land-grant was the provision in the bill that in case Kansas should fail to accept the terms thus offered the whole question of statehood should be postponed until the territory should have a population equal to the unit of Congressional representation. This has been regarded as a threat but is so reasonable as a matter of principle that there seems to be but small occasion to denounce it; at present it is customary to require a population equal to twice the unit of representation.

The concluding paper of the session, that of Professor James A. Woodburn of Indiana University, on "The Attitude of Thaddeus Stevens toward the Conduct of the Civil War", appears in full in a subsequent part of the present number of this journal.

It remains to speak of the annual business meeting, always one of the most interesting portions of the session, to those who appreciate or take part in the varied activities which mark the progress of the Association throughout the intervals between meetings. In the annual report of the Executive Council the most important passage was that which dealt with the problems connected with the Association's publications and particularly with the readjustments made necessary by the reduced appropriation by Congress, or (more exactly, so far as the present year is concerned) allotment by the Smithsonian Institution, of \$5,000 for the printing of the Annual Report.<sup>1</sup> It has been impossible under the appropriation for the current fiscal year to provide for gratuitous distribution to the members of volume two of the Report for 1905, which is now in press;

<sup>1</sup> The Sundry Civil Appropriation Act of March 3, 1907, increases the appropriation (in a sense, restores it) to \$7,000 for the ensuing fiscal year.

at a later time the members will be notified that they can procure copies of this volume at cost from the Public Printer. It consists of Mr. A. P. C. Griffin's *Bibliography of American Historical Societies*. Provision has also been made for the separate printing of Mr. David S. Muzzey's monograph on "The Spiritual Franciscans", which was awarded the Herbert Baxter Adams prize in December 1905, but which by reason of its ecclesiastical character was debarred by the Smithsonian Institution from publication.

The Council also reported that it had found it necessary to reorganize the Committee on Publications so as to include the chairmen of the three committees which furnish the greater part of the material for the annual volume, and to instruct the committee to consider carefully the amount and distribution of space in the Annual Report, so as to bring the cost of the Report within the amount appropriated by Congress. On recommendation of the Council the Association voted to hold the meeting of 1907 in Madison, Wisconsin, and the meeting of 1908 in Richmond, Virginia, with one day's session in Washington, provided satisfactory arrangements can be made with the railroads for rates from Washington. Professor George B. Adams, it was announced, had been re-elected by the Council as a member of the Board of Editors of the *AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW*, for the term ending January 1, 1913.

No action of the Association was taken with a more cordial unanimity and none has been received with more hearty commendations by the public press than the election of Mr. James Bryce, upon the proposal of the Council, to honorary membership in the Association. The Association has in its whole history had but four honorary members: first Ranke, then Stubbs and Gardiner and Mommsen. It was felt that the new British ambassador had claims of the highest kind to any honor which the Association could offer him.

The treasurer's report showed net receipts of \$8,490, net expenses of \$7,534, an increase of about \$950 in the funds of the Association, and total assets of \$24,189.

The secretary of the Pacific Coast Branch reported upon its work for the past year and particularly on the third annual meeting held at Portland, Oregon, on November 30 and December 1.

The chairman of the Historical Manuscripts Commission, Dr. J. F. Jameson, reported that the appropriation for the year 1906 had been consumed in the completion of the work on the diplomatic archives of the Republic of Texas, undertaken by the preceding commission, and that it had not been practicable to take up new enter-

prises until that work had been disposed of. The chairman of the Public Archives Commission, Professor Herman V. Ames, reported that the commission had prepared for publication in the Annual Report for 1906 reports on the state (or in some cases local) archives of Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Ohio, Tennessee, Virginia and West Virginia, a bibliography of the published archive-material of the thirteen original states from the beginning of the colonial period to 1789, and a summary of recent legislation by the states for the care and supervision of state and local archives. It had also arranged for the continuance of the work of selecting and copying documents in England relating to America, under the direction of a sub-committee, of which Professor Charles M. Andrews is chairman.

The Committee on the Justin Winsor Prize announced the award of that prize to Miss Annie Heloise Abel, of the faculty of the Women's College of Baltimore, for her monograph on "The History of Events resulting in Indian Consolidation west of the Mississippi River". The Association voted to adopt the committee's recommendation that the prize be henceforth \$200 instead of \$100, and that it be awarded biennially, beginning with December, 1908. The Association also voted, on the joint recommendation of the committees on the Adams and Winsor Prizes, to define the areas to which these prizes respectively refer as follows: for the Justin Winsor Prize, American history, by which is meant the history of any of the British colonies in America to 1783, or of other territories, continental or insular, which have since been acquired by the United States, and of independent Latin America; for the Herbert Baxter Adams Prize, European history, by which is meant the history of Europe, continental, insular or colonial, excluding continental French America and British America before 1783.

The Committee on Bibliography reported that progress had been made upon a check-list of the chief collections of sources of European history in American libraries, and that this would doubtless be in print before the next meeting of the Association. The General Committee reported that they had begun a systematic inquiry into the marking of historic sites, which they planned to finish during the coming year. The editor of the *Original Narratives of Early American History* reported the publication of two volumes during the autumn just passed, and the expectation that another would appear in February and two more during the spring. The Committee of Eight on History in Elementary Schools reported, as has been mentioned above, that their final report might be expected to appear in print in the course of the year 1907.

Complimentary resolutions of the usual character were presented and passed. The committee on nominations, Messrs. A. C. McLaughlin, E. L. Stevenson and J. A. Woodburn, proposed a list of officers, all of whom were chosen by the Association. Dr. J. Franklin Jameson was elected president, Professor George B. Adams first vice-president, and Professor Albert Bushnell Hart second vice-president. Mr. A. Howard Clark, Professor C. H. Haskins and Dr. Clarence W. Bowen were re-elected to their former positions. In the place of Professors Bourne and McLaughlin, who had been thrice elected to the Executive Council, Mr. Worthington C. Ford and Professor William MacDonald were chosen.

OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL  
ASSOCIATION

<i>President,</i>	J. Franklin Jameson, Washington.
<i>First Vice-president,</i>	Professor George B. Adams, New Haven.
<i>Second Vice-president,</i>	Professor Albert Bushnell Hart, Cambridge.
<i>Secretary,</i>	A. Howard Clark, Esq., Smithsonian Institution, Washington.
<i>Corresponding Secretary,</i>	Professor Charles H. Haskins, 15 Prescott Hall, Cambridge, Mass.
<i>Treasurer,</i>	Clarence W. Bowen, Esq., 130 Fulton Street, New York.

*Executive Council* (in addition to the above-named officers):

Hon. Andrew Dickson White, <sup>1</sup>	Professor Goldwin Smith, <sup>1</sup>
President James Burrill Angell, <sup>1</sup>	Professor John Bach McMaster, <sup>1</sup>
Henry Adams, Esq., <sup>1</sup>	Hon. Simeon E. Baldwin, <sup>1</sup>
James Schouler, Esq., <sup>1</sup>	Professor George P. Garrison,
Professor George Park Fisher, <sup>1</sup>	Reuben G. Thwaites, Esq.,
James Ford Rhodes, Esq., <sup>1</sup>	Professor Charles M. Andrews,
Charles Francis Adams, Esq., <sup>1</sup>	Professor James H. Robinson,
Captain Alfred Thayer Mahan, <sup>1</sup>	Worthington C. Ford, Esq.,
Henry Charles Lea, Esq., <sup>1</sup>	Professor William MacDonald.

*Committees:*

*Committee on Programme for the Twenty-third Annual Meeting:* Professor Alfred L. P. Dennis, University of Wisconsin, chairman; Charles H. Haskins, Frank H. Hodder, Andrew C. McLaughlin, Frederick J. Turner, and Claude H. Van Tyne.

<sup>1</sup> Ex-presidents.

*Joint Local Committee of Arrangements for the Next Annual Meeting of the American Historical Association, the American Economic Association, the American Political Science Association, and the American Sociological Society:* Burr W. Jones, Esq., Madison, Wisconsin, chairman; Richard T. Ely, Carl R. Fish, Dana C. Munro, Paul S. Reinsch, Edward A. Ross, R. G. Thwaites, and William F. Vilas.

*Committee on the Entertainment of Ladies at the Above Meeting:* Mrs. Lucius Fairchild, Madison, Wisconsin, chairman; Mrs. William F. Allen, and Miss Ida M. Tarbell.

*Editors of the American Historical Review:* Professor George B. Adams, Yale University, chairman; George L. Burr, Albert Bushnell Hart, J. Franklin Jameson, Andrew C. McLaughlin, and William M. Sloane.

*Historical Manuscripts Commission:* J. Franklin Jameson, Carnegie Institution of Washington, chairman; Edward G. Bourne, Worthington C. Ford, Frederick W. Moore, Thomas M. Owen, and James A. Woodburn.

*Committee on the Justin Winsor Prize:* Professor Charles H. Hull, Cornell University, chairman; Edward P. Cheyney, Evarts B. Greene, John H. Latané, and Williston Walker.

*Public Archives Commission:* Professor Herman V. Ames, University of Pennsylvania, chairman; Charles M. Andrews, Clarence S. Brigham, Carl R. Fish, Herbert L. Osgood, Dunbar Rowland, and Robert T. Swan.

*Committee on Bibliography:* Professor Ernest C. Richardson, Princeton University, chairman; Appleton P. C. Griffin, William C. Lane, Victor H. Paltsits, James T. Shotwell, and Wilbur H. Siebert.

*Committee on Publications:* Professor William A. Dunning, Columbia University, chairman; Herman V. Ames, A. Howard Clark, Charles H. Haskins, J. Franklin Jameson, and Ernest C. Richardson.

*Committee on the Herbert Baxter Adams Prize:* Professor Charles Gross, Harvard University, chairman; George L. Burr, Victor Coffin, James W. Thompson, and John M. Vincent. (During the absence of Professor Gross in Europe after June 1, 1907, Professor Burr will act as chairman.)



*General Committee:* Professor Benjamin F. Shambaugh, State University of Iowa, chairman; Henry E. Bourne, William E. Dodd, Earle W. Dow, Charles H. Haskins, Frank H. Hodder, Susan M. Kingsbury, Franklin L. Riley, Lucy M. Salmon, Frank H. Severance, and Frederick G. Young.

*Finance Committee:* James H. Eckels and Peter White.

*Committee of Eight on History in Elementary Schools:* Professor James A. James, Northwestern University, chairman; Henry E. Bourne, Eugene C. Brooks, Wilbur F. Gordy, Mabel Hill, Julius Sachs, Henry W. Thurston, and J. H. Van Sickle.

*Conference of State and Local Historical Societies:* Frank H. Severance, Buffalo Historical Society, chairman; Evarts B. Greene, secretary.